



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,770	11/08/2000	Yin Cheng	003636.0103	9945
7590 06/18/2008 MANELLI, DENISON & SELTER PLLC ATTN: WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN 2000 M STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20016				
EXAMINER				
HU, JINSONG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/18/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/707,770

**Applicant(s)**

CHENG ET AL.

**Examiner**

JINSONG HU

**Art Unit**

2154

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 33, 58-73, 106-109, 113 and 117 have been amended.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 108, 117 and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 108, 117 and 119 are direct to "means". However, applicant does not provide any definition for "means" in the specification, it makes the term could be interpreted in any existing format, such as signal or carrier wave, which apparently do not fall within any statutory categories. Examiner suggests removing the term from the claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

5. Claims 1-7, 9-10, 14, 33-38, 40-41, 45, 58-65, 67-68, 72, 106-111, 113-115 and 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al. (US 6,247,048) in view of Holland et al. (US 6,507,867).

6. As per claim 1, Greer teaches the invention as claimed including a method for extracting and reformatting web page content into a format readable on a mobile device [col. 1, lines 7-12; col. 6, lines 16-20], comprising the steps of:

providing a secure connection between a mobile device and a proxy server [410, Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 39-52];

generating a user request from the mobile device to the proxy server for a web page having a first format, wherein the web page resides on an origin web server [420, Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 32-36 & 60-64; col. 9, lines 10-12];

forwarding the user request from the proxy server to the origin web server [430, Fig. 4; col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 6; col. 9, lines 13-17];

receiving at the proxy server the web page from the origin web server [440, Fig. 4; col. 7, lines 7-10; col. 9 lines 18-19]; and

transmitting to the mobile device the filtered desired content using the secure connection [col. 7, lines 20-26; col. 9, line 27].

7. Greer does not specifically teach site-mining at the proxy server to extract content from said web page according to predefined criteria. However, Holland on the other hand teaches site-mining at the proxy server to extract content from said web

page according to predefined criteria [col. 11, lines 35-64]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Holland's site-mining step in Greer's system because it is a well known feature in the art for filtering the web site data content for user.

8. As per claim 2, Greer teaches the step of identifying portions of source code corresponding to the desired content of the web page, wherein the source code is comprised of objects [col. 6, lines 32-36] and creating at least one expression using at least one predefined extraction method, wherein the expression extracts an object referenced in the at least one expression [col. 7, lines 13-19].

9. As per claim 3, Greer teaches the step of storing the reformatted web page in a cache prior to said step of transmitting [col. 7, lines 23-26].

10. As per claim 4, Greer teaches the step of storing the web page having the first format in a cache [col. 7, lines 11-13].

11. As per claim 5, Greer teaches reformatting is applied in accordance with predetermined instructions for at least two mobile devices having a predefined common characteristic [col. 6, lines 7-8].

Art Unit: 2154

12. As per claim 6, Greer teaches the predefined characteristic is least one of a type of operating system, a type of browser, and a manufacturer [col. 5, lines 30-32].

13. As per claim 7, Greer teaches the reformatting step is applied in accordance with predetermined instructions to a particular mobile device [col. 7, lines 13-19].

14. As per claims 9 and 10, Greer teaches the reformatting is applied in accordance with predetermined instructions for a particular web page or all web pages [col. 7, lines 10-19].

15. As per claim 14, Greer teaches the reformatting step comprises at least one of adding meta tag information to a header of the web page, adding a specific attribute and an attribute value to a specific tag associated with the web page, ignoring a previously specified global conversion, inserting text into the web page from a specified file, removing a specific attribute from all tags associated with the web page, removing a specific attribute from a specific tag associated with the web page, removing a comments tag from the web page, removing a portion of the content from the web page, removing a specific tag from the web page, removing a specific tag and all the information that appears within the tag from the web page, replacing a first tag associated with the web page with a second tag associated with the web page, setting a specific value of a specific attribute of a specific tag, stopping processing of subsequent reformatting commands, substituting a first sequence of text for a second sequence of

text, and removing table formatting [col. 7, lines 26-67].

Greer does not specifically teach site-mining at the proxy server desired content from the web page. However, Holland on the other hand teaches site-mining at the proxy server desired content from the web page [col. 11, lines 35-64]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Holland's site-mining step in Greer's system because it is a well known feature in the art for filtering the web site data content for user.

16. As per claims 33-38, 40-41 and 45, since they are system claims of 1-7, 9-10 and 14, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-7, 9-10 and 14 above.

17. As per claims 58-65, 67-68 and 72, since they are program claims of 1-7, 9-10 and 14, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-7, 9-10 and 14 above.

18. As per claims 106-108, Greer teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach the step of filtering the web page content in accordance with a limitation associated with the mobile device the web page content is viewable on, the limitation comprising at least one of a type of content viewer and type of operating system provided by said mobile device. However, Holland on the other hand teaches the step of filtering the web page content in accordance with a limitation associated with the mobile device the web page content is viewable on, the limitation comprising at least one of a type of content viewer and type of operating system

provided by said mobile device [col. 10, lines 27-52; col. 11, line 35 – col. 12, line 3; col. 14, lines 5-14]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Greer and Holland because doing so would bring convenience to user by enable them to view the content reformatted particular for their terminals.

19. As per claim 109, Greer teaches a method for extracting and reformatting web page content into a format tailored for a mobile device, comprising of providing a connection between said mobile device and a proxy server [410, Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 39-52]; providing client device related information to said proxy server from said mobile device, said client device related information comprising at least one of a content viewer and operating system [col. 8, lines 5-8 & 22-25], retrieving content requested by said mobile device from said proxy server [420, Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 32-36 & 60-64; col. 9, lines 10-12], conversion of said content based on said client device related information [col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 9, lines 24-26 ], and forwarding said converted content to said client device [col. 7, lines 20-26; col. 9, line 27].

20. Greer does not specifically teach site-mining at the proxy server desired content from the web page. However, Holland on the other hand teaches site-mining at the proxy server desired content from the web page [col. 11, lines 35-64]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made



Art Unit: 2154

to include Holland's site-mining step in Greer's system because it is a well known feature in the art for filtering the web site data content for user.

21. As per claim 110, Greer teaches the client device related information sent to the proxy server from the mobile device is provided in a header [col. 7, lines 26-67].

22. As per claim 111, Greer teaches the step of comparing said client device related information [i.e., client character set] to a client value [i.e., the character used in the response] stored in said proxy server for said client device [col. 8, lines 33-44].

23. As per claims 113-115 and 117-119, since they are system and apparatus claims of claims 109-111, they are rejected for the same basis Greer claims 109-111 above.

24. Claims 8, 11-13, 15, 39, 42-44, 46, 66, 69-71, 73, 112, 116 and 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al. (US 6,247,048) in view of Holland et al. (US 6,507,867) as applied to claims 1-7, 9-10, 14, 33-38, 40-41, 45, 58-65, 67-68, 72, 106-111, 113-115 and 117-119 above, further in view of Official Notice.

25. As per claims 8, 112, 116 and 120, Greer teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model

Art Unit: 2154

is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model in Greer's system because it would make the reformatting less complicated by providing the corresponding information of mobile device that can be used as reformat converting reference.

26. As per claims 11-13 and 15, Greer teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach the secure connection is a secure socket layer connection through a gateway. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for secure socket layer connection is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include secure socket layer connection in Greer's system because it would improve the security of the system by provide a secure communication path for entire system.

27. As per claims 39, 42-44 and 46, since they are system claims of 8, 11-13 and 15, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 8, 11-13 and 15 above.

28. As per claims 66, 69-71 and 73, since they are program claims 8, 11-13 and 15, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 8, 11-13 and 15 above.

***Conclusion***

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*/Jinsong Hu/*

*Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154*